

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application.

Amendments to the Claims

Minor changes have been made to the pending claims, without altering the scope thereof, to place them in better form for U.S. practice.

Amendments to the Drawings

Fig. 6 has been amended so that it is consistent with the statements in the specification.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve and enter this drawing change.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabeler (USP 6,594,746) in view of Badoo (USP 3,803,559). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1 and 17

Claim 1 and 17 has been amended to claim

access permission address range setting means for setting, prior to each execution of an application program, an address range within which access by the application program to be executed is permitted.

By providing such a feature, the claimed invention of the present application ensures that each application program accesses

only the portion of a memory it was meant to access, and further, as disclosed in page 21, lines 15-18 of the specification, the claimed invention allows application programs to be executed consecutively without affecting other application programs.

By contrast, the combination of Rabeler and Badoo fails to teach or suggest such a feature. More specifically, Rabeler states, in col. 3, lines 29-32, that "[E]ach user program is assigned one or more segments of memory when the user program is written. Rabeler, however, does not set an address range "prior to each execution of the application program," as recited in claim 1.

Rabeler does state, in col. 3, lines 32-34, that "[T]hese assignments can be later modified by a system program." However, the system program is not called prior to each execution of the user program to assign memory segments to the user program.

Rather, the system program is called after a special jump instruction, which transitions a mode of operation from a user mode to a system mode. Such a special jump appears to be carried out in the middle of execution of a program rather than prior to execution of the program (col. 4, lines 40-46).

Therefore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Rabeler and Badoo can be combined, Rabeler in view of Badoo fails to disclose or even suggest the "access permission address range setting means" as recited in claim 1.

Claim 9, dependent on claim 1, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 1.

Claim 17 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Independent Claims 2 and 18

As previously stated in the Request for Consideration filed August 4, 2004, the 1-chip microcomputer of the claimed invention of the present application claims "a monitor flag" that is not taught or suggested by Rabeler and Bando.

The Examiner alleges, in the "Response to Arguments" in pages 8-10 of the Office Action that the mode bit of Rabeler teaches the monitor flag of the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 2 of the present application claims "a monitor flag for toggling a flag indicating that a predetermined address space is being accessed." By contrast, the mode bit of Rabeler indicates whether the microprocessor operates in a system mode or a user mode.

The "flag" of the present invention and the mode bit of Rabeler are clearly different because the "flag" indicates that a specified address space is accessed, and the mode bit indicates a mode of operation. Applicants do not clearly understand as to how

an access to a specified address space can be construed to be mode of operation.

In the *Response to Arguments*, the Examiner further states that

Rabaler teaches a mode bit that when set to correspond to a user mode, disables access to particular segments of memory, whereas when set to a system mode all segments are accessible.

According to the Examiner, the mode bit indicates which segments of memory are accessible. Apparently, indicating as to which segments of memory are accessible is very different from indicating that a specified address is accessed. Being accessible is not the same as being accessed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Rabaler and Bando taken singly or in combination do not toggle "a flag indicating that a predetermined address space is being accessed." Accordingly, both Rabaler and Bando fail to disclose or even suggest the "monitor flag" as recited in claim 2.

Claims 3-7 and 10-15, variously dependent on claim 2, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 2.

Claim 18 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with respect to claim 2.

Claims 19-21, variously dependent on claim 18, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 18.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 8, 16, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabeler in view of Bando, and further in view of Oppenheimer (David L. Oppenheimer et al. "Performance Signatures: A mechanism for Intrusion Detection," 1997 Information Survivability Workshop - ISW '97). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8 and 16, variously dependent on claim 2, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 2.

Claim 22, indirectly dependency on claim 18, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 18.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

#### Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims in the present application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final in that it raises no new issues. Alternatively, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final in that it places the application in better form for Appeal.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$450.00 is attached hereto.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (Reg. No. 40,417) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Charles Gorenstein, #29,271

CG:MH/pjh  
1248-0537P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

Attachment: One (1) Replacement Drawing Sheet - Fig. 6

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto is one (1) replacement drawing sheet that complies with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. The replacement drawing incorporates the following drawing changes:

In Fig. 6, an arrow pointing from the INTERRUPTION CONTROL CIRCUIT 521 towards the MEMORY WRITING CONTROL CIRCUIT 310 has been amended to point towards the INTERRUPTION CONTROL CIRCUIT 521.

It is respectfully requested that the replacement drawing be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.